



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

of the picture of Adonis, and the story of Cupid. Each of these passages fills up and rounds out the picture which it closes; the song read without them fails to give us as a whole the feeling of sumptuousness it was certainly intended to give.

Lycidas came to Milton's imagination, or at least to paper, in a very perfect form. He writes the first fourteen lines, and then tries the flower passage, which was evidently haunting his thought. He sets it down once; crosses it all out and begins over again. Line 146 was nearer inspiration as first written, *the muske rose and the garish columbine*, but perhaps it did not express his feeling for the flower, or it did not sound appropriate to have so gaudy a flower about the dead. Ruskin calls 148 "mixed fancy and imagination"; the first version, *every bud that sorrows liverie weares*, is also mixed but perhaps less objectionable than the form we are familiar with. After the flower passage is to his mind, he takes a fresh sheet and, commencing the poem once more, writes to the end with very little recasting, except at 58-62, which he thrice revises. Save for these two difficult parts, Milton seems to have written *Lycidas* with little premeditation and hence with ease.

The Sonnets, fifteen in number, including *On the Forcers of Conscience*—the only ones not in this manuscript are I, XVIII, XIX, XX—are fairly free from corrections, except in the case of single words, and these not numerous. Three only have been revised to any extent. The thirteenth, to Lawes, Milton seems to have been so particular about, so careful to have of the right shade of dignity that he has refined away much of the vividness of phrase; there is a strength and sureness in the first draft that the second lacks. For example, line 4, *misjoining* is better than *committing*; line 6, *and gives thee praise above the pipe of Pan*, is easier grasped by the imagination than the line as we have it about *Envy*. Again lines 12 and 13 are swifter as first written: *by the Tuscan's leav, shall set thee higher then old Casella whom Dante woo'd to sing*. He appears to have had a like thought about Sonnet XIV, to Mrs. Thomson; it must be stately, large-sounding, and the rewriting has had the similar result of making the Sonnet less vigorous. The revision of Sonnet XI is not so great in the number of changes made, but it has almost as marked an effect upon the whole; here

with quite a different subject and doubtless for a very different reason, he has really accomplished much the same thing as in working over the other two—taken some of the strength and life out of it. It began *I writ a book*, and lines 3 and 4 read *it went off well about the town a while, numbering good wits; but now is seldom poured on*. The change to the third person and passive voice which he made in revising, has not improved it.

It is true, indeed, that in a few cases Milton's second idea is less poetic than the first, but in most instances the later thought is by far the more inspired, and the work of revision has been wisely expended. The manuscript shows, moreover, that although he was a poet who generally worked with a good deal of ease and changed comparatively little, yet he was also an untiring critic of his own poems; and that many words and phrases, as well as occasional long passages, cost him much labor in bringing the thought to the fulfilment of expression.

LAURA E. LOCKWOOD.

Wellesley College.

CHANGES IN ENGLISH USAGE BETWEEN 1878 AND 1902 AS SHOWN IN THE TEXTBOOKS OF AN AMERICAN PURIST.

That language is subject to perpetual change has long been accepted as a truism by philologists; and even conservative purists admit theoretically that the business of the lexicographer and of the grammarian is merely to record in a convenient form usages accepted by recent writers or speakers of national reputation and that the critic's conclusion is merely an expression of personal opinion which is frequently overruled. Thus does our representative American purist, Professor Adams Sherman Hill, set forth in 1878, in his *Principles of Rhetoric*, the varying standards of English usage; and his later rhetorics, published, respectively, in 1892, in 1895, and in 1902, furnish striking illustrations of his own enforced variation of opinion within a period of less than twenty-five years. These variations of opinion, it is true, may be attributed not so much to changes that have actually taken place since

1878 as to a purist's slow recognition of usages already more or less established. But since Professor Hill's rhetorics were for many years the authority in matters of usage in the best American schools and colleges, I feel justified in considering his varying standards as representative of the changes in English usage forced on all American purists during the last quarter of the nineteenth century.

Dr. Fitzedward Hall, by his many scholarly articles which appeared in the *Nation* from 1880 to 1901, no doubt greatly influenced Professor Hill to practice in his later rhetorics what he had preached in his first; for Dr. Hall was not only ever ready to cite a formidable array of the best authors in support of any usage attacked by purists, but he was also alert to seize every opportunity to illustrate the ever-changing character of English speech. Professor Hill, in modifying his early dogmatic assertions on points of usage, more than once admits his indebtedness to Dr. Hall. And in his rhetoric of 1902, we find that though he still clings in a few instances to his early prejudices, yet on the whole he has desisted from any futile attempt to keep words, whatever their origin, or usages, however erratic, from finding their way into English speech provided they have received the stamp of recognition from "reputable people of our nation and time."

In modifying his opinion in his later books in regard to such usages as *had rather*,¹ *had better*, and *try and*, Professor Hill implies that he had too severely criticised these expressions in 1878. For instance, he then preferred, on the principles of analogy, *would rather* and *would better*; but in 1895 he does not hesitate to admit that "*had rather* and *had better* are idiomatic expressions older than parsing itself, and hence are quite as good English as *would rather* and *might better*." As he refers for a further discussion of these locutions to an article by Dr. Hall in *The American Journal of Philology* (vol. ii, no. 7, pp. 281-322), he indirectly acknowledges the influence of Dr. Hall's many citations of the reputable use of *had rather* and *had better* for more than four centuries. In regard to the idiom *try and*, Dr. Hall's quotations from some of the best writers

since 1826 (*Nation*, vol. 48 (1889), p. 426) were equally effective; for though Professor Hill had in 1878 classed *try and* as a vulgarism, in 1902 he boldly declares that "such expressions as *try and remember*, *come and see me*, are idioms which, though they disturb some grammarians, really give life to the language."

Other locutions which Professor Hill has been slow to admit as being in good use are *in this connection*, *the ones*, *firstly*, and *guess* in the sense of *incline to think*; and, indeed, in spite of Dr. Hall's citation of their use by many authors of reputation, he does not yet accept these unqualifiedly. After Dr. Hall's article in 1888 (*Nation*, vol. 46, p. 12) which proved conclusively that *in this connection* had been in good use for fifty years, and that the analogous phrases *in all its connections*, *out of its connection*, etc., had been used by good authors since 1780, Professor Hill in 1902 could no longer, as in 1878, class *in this connection* as a "provincialism"; hence in his latest rhetoric he probably expresses merely his own personal aversion to the phrase by calling it "an overworked expression." In his criticism of *the ones*, Professor Hill is more lenient; for though he does not go so far as Dr. Hall and declare that *the ones* is in no case at variance with accepted English usage (*Nation*, vol. 53 (1891), p. 195), yet, in 1902, he does not object to the plural of *one* when it marks a contrast between individuals in a class or group. *Firstly*, an older usage than either *in this connection* or *the ones*, is probably on the wane; but Professor Hill's criticism of it in 1902 is milder than it was in 1878, when he classed it as a "vulgarism." Dr. Hall's indirect justification of *firstly* in 1888 (*Nation*, vol. 46, p. 215), probably led Professor Hill in 1892 to find "the adverbial form of *first* in serious writings by good authors," and to admit in 1902 that, "though *first* serves as both adjective and adverb, *firstly* is occasionally seen."

As to Professor Hill's present attitude toward *guess*, we have only circumstantial evidence. In 1878, he classed *guess* with *fancy*, *reckon*, and *calculate*, as not being "in reputable use" when intended "to express opinion, expectation, or intention." In 1895, *fancy* was omitted from the list; and *guess*, *reckon*, and *calculate* became merely "provincialisms." In 1902, only *reckon*

¹ For all words discussed, see indexes of Professor Hill's rhetorics.

and *calculate* were left among words "not national." Dr. Hall in 1893, had, it is true, cited quotations dating from the fourteenth century showing that *guess* in the sense of *incline to think, be disposed to believe*, was irreproachable; and, in the same article (*Nation*, vol. 57, p. 485), he had also asserted that *reckon*, though not a common literary term, would never be censured by a British critic. Yet our American purists persisted, for a few years longer, in stigmatizing *guess* as a provincialism, and they have not yet lifted the bann from *reckon*. But since Professor Hill, our standard purist, does not criticise *Ifancy* after 1878, and omits *I guess* in 1902, is there not hope that *I reckon* may not forever be a Southern shibboleth?

Though *gotten* for *got* does not strictly belong in the group just discussed, it has had too varied an experience to be omitted altogether; and the older participial form, *gotten*, is still sufficiently common in the South to deserve the slight justification of having once been the form preferred by the great purist himself. But though Professor Hill in 1878 actually preferred, for the sake of perspicuity, *gotten* as the past participle, yet by 1895 he considered the use of *gotten* for *got* "due either to ignorance or to affectation." In 1902, however, he admits that though the current of the best usage is against *gotten*, "it is still sometimes found in authors of repute."

As interesting, perhaps, as the usages which Professor Hill has only tardily, or grudgingly, admitted into literary language are the usages which he has refused to accept. Among these are such words and phrases as *scientist*, *predicate* in the sense of *predict*, *preventative*, *in our midst*, *onto*, and "the split infinitive." In still tabooing *scientist*, Professor Hill seems to have some support; yet in 1878, in spite of his own preference, "under the canon of ancient usage," for *man of science*, he wisely predicted that the superior brevity of *scientist* was likely to carry the day. And this seems to have been the case, notwithstanding his assertion in 1902 that *scientist* is still "looked upon with disfavor by some writers of reputation including not a few men of science." As Dr. Hall in 1890 (*Nation*, vol. 51, p. 402) proves that the structure of *scientist* (Low Latin, *scientista*) is strictly normal, and that there is

therefore no scholarly reason for its disfavor, are not its opponents indulging merely their own personal prejudice?

That personal prejudice is normal even for those who consider themselves most liberal in regard to the standard of usage is, perhaps, better shown by the non-purist's attitude toward such words as *preventative* for *preventive* and *predicate* for *predict*. Though *preventative* has been used since 1676 (*Nation*, vol. 47 (1888), p. 269), yet few would censure Professor Hill severely for asserting in 1902 that *preventative* is "not a real word." *Predicate* for *predict* has met, on this side of the Atlantic, even greater opposition. According to the *New English Dictionary*, *predicate* for *predict* was used, even if erroneously, as early as 1623; and according to Dr. Hall (*Nation*, vol. 57 (1893), p. 45), *predicate* in this sense proved "so attractive to the eye and seductive to the ear as to mark the language of Parliament in 1867." And according to the same authority its comparative sonorosity also appealed to Sydney Smith, Trollope, and Dickens. Nevertheless, the *Century*, the most catholic of dictionaries, excludes the word in the sense of *predict* altogether. No wonder then, that Mr. John Bigelow's sanction of this use of *predicate*, in 1890, was not sufficient to modify Professor Hill's 1895 criticism of it as "an impropriety found in some American newspapers." But though the non-purist and the purist often agree, as in the case of *preventative* and *predicate*, their attitude is essentially different. The purist always excuses his pet prejudices logically; for instance, he says in regard to these words that having the simpler forms the longer ones are superfluous. The ideal non-purist, on the other hand, does not try to keep *other* people from inventing new words or from putting any meaning they choose into old words; and even if he does not like such usages, he, more readily than the purist, submits to the inevitable law of language, which makes the varying standards of "yesterday, to-day, and to-morrow."

Phrases which supply "antecedent blanks" and which avoid awkward circumlocutions are therefore usually immediately welcomed by all save the exclusive purists. *In our midst* is such a locution; but, though it has been used by good

authors since 1631 (*Nation*, vol. 66 (1898), p. 263), Professor Hill even in 1902 insists that it is "avoided by so many careful writers, and condemned by so many critics, that it may never fight its way into the accepted language." This we must conclude is merely a pet aversion of Professor Hill's favorite authors. One would have supposed that purists would have objected far more to *onto* than to *in our midst*, but Professor Hill admits in 1902 that *onto* seems to be gaining ground, and may in time get a foothold in the language. And, in spite of Dr. Hall's direct criticism of Professor Hill's 1892 objection to *onto*, the latter generously refers for a further discussion of this usage to Dr. Hall's article in the *Nation* (vol. 70 (1900), p. 281), in which are cited numerous examples of the use of *onto* since 1460, including such literary names as Shelley, George Eliot, and John Morley.

But, perhaps, "the split infinitive" has caused the largest and most interesting usage controversy of modern times. Dr. Hall had, apparently, said the last word, when, in 1893 (*Nation*, vol. 56, p. 274), he added to his formidable array of citations² ranging from the time of Wickliffe to the present day such authorities as Goldsmith, Dr. Johnson, Lord Macaulay, De Quincey, and Cardinal Newman; but Professor Hill in 1902 closes his discussion of this subject with the somewhat dogmatic advice: "Do not put an adverb between *to* and the infinitive." In spite of this rule, however, he does admit that usage is to a certain extent divided in regard to the cleft infinitive; and, again, he magnanimously refers to the article in the *Nation*, mentioned above, in which Dr. Hall had concluded that before very long the cleft infinitive, whenever it contributed to euphony, terseness, or avoidance of ambiguity, would be accounted not only permissible but laudable.

So far, the words and phrases discussed, though they had not been accepted by purists, had more or less claim to recognition before 1878; but such neologisms as *an editorial*, *an elective*, and *telegram* are representative of usages which, though originating before that time, are still, with the exception of *an editorial*, branded by some lexicographers as colloquial. Professor Hill, however, does not make even this exception. Though

Webster's *Dictionary* had as early as 1879 recorded the substantive of *editorial* as being in good use, Professor Hill in 1902, with his usual conservatism, merely prophesies that "it may in time be accepted." To our surprise, however, he puts *an elective* on an equal footing with *an editorial*. This would seem natural enough, especially to one familiar with American college dialect, were it not that this word in its educational sense is completely ignored by the *Standard* and by the *New English Dictionary*, and even in the 1900 edition of the *Century* and in the 1907 edition of Webster it is still branded as an American colloquialism. Nevertheless, *an elective*, *an inaugural*, *an electric*, *a postal*, as well as *an editorial*, are merely following the worthy example of hosts of other adjectives which have become substantives, such as *a private*,³ *a general*, *a lyric*, and *a constitutional*. And as Dr. Crothers says of the Fletcherizer who chews his onion seven hundred times, "Since we have to swallow them sooner or later, why not show a reasonable cheerfulness in the matter?"

This, many lexicographers and purists, including Professor Hill, failed to do in the case of *telegram*; but now that the *New English Dictionary* shows that the *Athenæum* used it in 1880 and the *Times* in 1883, surely its hybrid origin will no longer prevent the language from assimilating it. *Boycott*, however, a word which originated as late as 1880, at least a dozen years after the appearance of *telegram*, was so much needed that it was almost immediately accepted as standard English. Professor Hill⁴ had, it is true, in 1882 prophesied that it would, "like other slang words, die a natural death," but by 1895 he was forced to admit that a word, "such as *boycott*, which supplies a permanent need in the language, may, whatever its origin, come into good use."

Professor Hill's textbooks do more, however, than illustrate a purist's changes in usage, they also indicate the several ways in which modifications in language come about. Among changes arising from the invention of new words, one finds such examples as *telegram*, *agriculturalist*, *brainy*, *an elective*, *an editorial*, *curios*, *to clerk*, *to deed*,

² Cf. Greenough and Kittredge, *Words and Their Ways in English Speech*, p. 254. The Macmillan Co., 1901.

⁴ See 1882 edition of *Principles of Rhetoric*.

¹ *The American Journal of Philology*, vol. iii, 1882.

to launder, to boycott; among changes caused by reviving old words, *back of* for *behind*, *clever* for *good-natured*, *eat* for *ate*; among usages brought about by the force of analogy, *in our midst*, *onto*, *meet with*, *try and*, *one—his* for *one—one's*; among doublets blurred by disregarding distinctions in meaning, *alone* and *only*, *aware* and *conscious*, *confess* and *admit*, *oral* and *verbal*; among doublets arising from the free use of technical or dialectic words, *wage* and *wage-fund*, *to depreciate*, *campus*, *to umpire*, *to referee*, and *lumber* for *timber*. Though Professor Hill, at one time or another, criticised these expressions severely, he now accepts them as being in more or less good colloquial use; and in a few instances such as *to boycott*, *to meet with*, *to depreciate*, *to launder*, *to try and*, *lumber*, *a verbal message*, and *confess* for *admit*, he gives them literary rank.

Thus, within a quarter of a century, we see that a purist of purists has been forced to accept former provincialisms, improprieties, barbarisms, and vulgarisms. And yet, though tabooed usages—whether they supply antecedent blanks or not—will no doubt continue to force their way into standard English, the gap between colloquial and literary language is likely to remain proportionately the same; for in spite of the perpetual flux of language, there is always a more or less clearly defined standard of present good usage.

ELIZABETH A. COLTON.

Meredith College.

Span. *cortesa*.

Brauns, *Krit. Jahresber.* x, iv 236, behauptet bei Besprechung von Runge, *Lecciones Castellanas*: "S. 9, L. II, 1. Z. rechts und ebenso im Wörterverzeichnis, S. 161, hat Runge die hübsche weibliche Form *cortesa* erfunden, von der die spanische Sprache nichts weiss!" Auch bei Menéndez Pidal, *Manual* § 78, 2, heisst es: "Hoy es de rigor la -a en los derivados de pueblos como *francesa*, *cordobesa*; pero rara en *montesa*, é imposible en *cortés*." Dem stelle ich die folgenden Beispiele gegenüber, die ich gelegentlich notiert. Alex. 1865 *una cortesa manna* (Morel-Fatio 2007 ebenso). Razón de Amor (Menéndez Pidal) 91

otra duena (l. *dona*), *cortesa e bela e bona*. S. Maria Egipcíaca (1907) 382 *tanto fue* (sc. Maria) *cortesa de su mester*. (Dagegen 1023 *La duenya cortés fue*; vgl. auch 750 *Semeiaua* (sc. Maria) *cortés*: *res*.) Caveda, *Poesías selectas en Dialecto asturiano* 74 (s. xvii) *Ella ansina i respuende muy cortesa: abadesa*. Dazu das Adverb: Crón. S. Juan de la Peña 31 *et muy cortesament sacó la criatura viua del vientre de su madre*. Prov. Beispiele bei Appel² xi b.

Hier mögen ein paar ähnliche Beispiele angeschlossen werden zur Bestätigung oder Ergänzung dessen, was Menéndez Pidal l. c. und Hansen, *Spanische Grammatik* § 41, 1, sagen. Diego Sanchez de Badajoz II 255 *Guay del pobre y de la pobra!* Ordinaciones de la Ciudad de Çaragoça I 233 *a las casas sobreditas comunas*; 239 *en las ditas casas comunas*. Santillana 440 *Ca singular, non comuna, Vos amo toda la gente, En virtudes excellente, De beldades la colupna*. Pedro Torrellas (C. Stúñiga 399) *la condicion . . . comuna: repuna*. Diego de Sevilla (Gallardo I 461) *comuna obseruancia*. Martin Garcia, Chaton (1467) 769 *tu cosa comuna: ninguna*; 1551 *quando vee la fortuna a muchos ser* (l. *seyer*) *comuna*. Caveda 302 (s. xix) *Una muyer homilde compañera, Cuala ye la Sabina*. La Olla asturiana 101 *pongo una condicion*.—*¿Cuala ye?* Lopez Allué, Capuletos y Montescos 307 *¿no sabís la novedá?*—*¿Cuálá?*—*insistió á su vez Raimunda*. Blasco, *Cuentos aragoneses* I 77 *bien podía usted hacer una obra é caridá*.—*¿Cuálá?* (Nach *cuala* dann *cualo*: Vigón, *Juegos y Rimas infantiles* recogidos en . . . Villaviciosa, Colunga y Caravia 147 *¿Cuáló quiés más Tocar ó llorar?* Sarcöhandy, *Annuaire Ec. Haut. Et.*, 1898, S. 92 *cualo quiés?* Lopez Allué 158 *Pero . . . hay un inconveniente—¿Cualo?* Blasco II 7 *¿Y cuálós son los cocheros?*) Betreffs prov. *quala*, *qualas* s. Jeanroy-Teulié, *Mystères prov.* xl. Caveda 70 (s. xvii) *¿Mas q'importa si ye la ãente tala Que . . . ?* Quatorze Romances judéo-espagnols, *Rev. hispanique* x 600 *tala hora*; 603 *tala hermosura*. (Caveda 198 (s. xix) *¿Ay, que talu está!*) Betreffs prov. *tala* s. Jeanroy-Teulié l. c. Diego Sanchez de Badajoz II 17 *á la iguala: declara*; 78 item: *crara*. *serviciala*, *seglara* bei Cuervo, *Apuntaciones* § 178. Libros de Astr. I 32 *otrossí este galápago muéuese muy mal á nadar et muy grauamiente. á semeiante de*